



CITY OF WATERTOWN, NEW YORK

CITY PLANNING BOARD
ROOM 304, WATERTOWN CITY HALL
245 WASHINGTON STREET
WATERTOWN, NEW YORK 13601-3380
(315) 785-7740

MEETING: December 1, 2020

PRESENT:

Michelle Capone, Acting Chair
Kerry Johnson
Neil Katzman
Michael Pierce

ALSO:

Michael A. Lumbis, Planning and Community
Development Director
Jennifer Voss, Senior Planner
Michael Delaney, City Engineer
Leta Harp, Secretary

ABSENT:

Larry Coburn, Planning Board Chair
T.J. Babcock
Linda Fields

Acting Planning Board Chair, Michelle Capone, called the December 1, 2020 Planning Board meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

Ms. Capone then asked for a motion regarding the Minutes from the October 26, 2020 Special Planning Board Meeting. Mr. Katzman made a motion to approve the minutes as written. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion, and all voted in favor.

Ms. Capone said that prior to commencing; she wanted to introduce and welcome Michael Pierce, the new Planning Board Member to the Planning Board.

SITE PLAN APPROVAL – 981 WATERMAN DRIVE, PARCEL NUMBER 9-43-101.005

The Planning Board then considered a request for a Site Plan Approval, submitted by Matthew J. Cervini, P.E. of GYMO, DPC on behalf of SHBP Realty Holdings, LLC for the construction of 624 and 960 square-foot building additions and a 1,632 square-foot loading dock canopy at 981 Waterman Drive, Parcel Number 9-43-101.005.

Matthew J. Cervini, P.E. of GYMO, DPC was in attendance to represent the project. Ms. Capone also recognized owner Thomas Scozzafava who was also in attendance.

Ms. Capone asked Mr. Cervini for an overview of the Site Plan and to address the summary items.

Mr. Cervini presented the site plan for the proposed project, with the current building and gravel driveway used to circulate back to the loading dock. He pointed out the concrete pad and stated some of the existing interior coolers were going to be replaced by a taller 624 square-foot cooler on the existing pad. He then pointed out the location of the 960 square foot building addition, and the addition of a 1,632 square-foot covering to the existing loading dock.

Mr. Cervini said they determined, based on the existing flows of the bakery compared to the current flows of the brewery in Sackets Harbor, it would have very little increase in the water or sewer flow to or from the building, and based on that information there would be no need for additional infrastructure from the City.

Ms. Capone then asked about the five summary items in Staff's memorandum.

Mr. Cervini addressed each summary item, beginning with the first item; Mr. Cervini said the first summary item said that the applicant must ensure that the parking information in the Preliminary Engineering Report matches what is shown on the drawings and provided on site. He said the map would have to indicate vehicular and pedestrian circulation as well. He said that was a typo in the Engineering Report and he will fix it to account for the two additional parking spaces in the large gravel area on the side of the building.

Ms. Capone then said Mr. Cervini could pass over summary item number two.

Mr. Cervini continued to summary item number three; the applicant must submit a revised C-101 drawing showing the proposed additions in bold line type to differentiate between the existing features and to mesh the plans with the Preliminary Engineering Report. Mr. Cervini said it will be corrected with a revision.

Mr. Cervini then addressed summary item number four; the applicant must submit a Photometric Plan to ensure that the project is adequately lit without any light spillage onto neighboring properties. Mr. Cervini said the architect will be adding additional lights for safety purposes, and he will provide a Photometric Plan that would show the existing and new proposed lights. Referring to the last summary item, Mr. Cervini said the applicant would obtain the Zoning Compliance Certificate and Building Permit from the City prior to construction of the proposed project.

Ms. Capone said she wanted to point out the Engineering comments, that the Planning Board was not requiring at this time, but to keep in mind going forward. The applicant may be required to upgrade the water service if future meter readings show the water usage is greater than 850 GPD or if proposed additional water demand is needed for improvements once the brewery is completed. At this time, the existing water service is sufficient to move forward with the proposed project described in the 11-17-20 report. Ms. Capone said if there were any changes in operations, upgrades, or water usage, the applicant may need to reevaluate sewer service upgrades if future water meter readings exceed the anticipated amounts in the engineering report, then additional work and Engineering approval would be required.

Mr. Cervini replied that the Engineering comments were discussed and understood by the applicant. He said they reevaluated and decided the structure upgrades were not necessary, and they were all in agreement that any changes to the water meter or GPD would require upgrades.

Ms. Capone said regarding Summary item number two it was at the discretion of the Planning Board to determine whether additional landscaping in the form of foundation plantings or other trees around the perimeter of the building and site to provide general beautification of the site should be required as outlined in the City Center Industrial Park Covenants and Restrictions. She asked what the applicant's proposal was.

Mr. Cervini replied at length listing the size, deciduous variety, and location of the proposed various trees, he listed; 18" Cherry, 12" Cherry, 15" Ash. He said existing on the site are several Colorado Spruce, 10" Oak, 10" and 12" ornamentals. He pointed these out on the Site Plan and said they would all be within the property lines.

Ms. Capone asked if Staff had any questions or comments on the proposed landscaping, had there been any complaints about landscape, and did it meet the expectations of the City Center Industrial Park Covenants.

Mr. Lumbis said there has not been any complaints, but he wanted to note, that all the properties within the City Center Industrial Park are subject to the covenants and restrictions when the properties are sold. He said all of the land is owned by the City but the Watertown Local Development Corporation has an option on all the land in the park and when it's sold it places the restrictions to regulate uses, beyond Zoning. The regulations also talk about landscaping, beautification, and screening of parking. Mr. Lumbis then said that the proposed landscaping was not required by zoning but were subject to the Covenants and restrictions which would have to be enforced by W.L.D.C., or if an adjoining property owner complained. Mr. Lumbis then said it was at the discretion of the Planning Board to decide if there was an additional need to what was existing and what had been proposed.

Mr. Pierce verified that the property was not being sold but was retaining its ownership, and this meeting was for Site Plan approval on the proposed additions.

Mr. Katzman wanted confirmation that the new brewery would use the same amount of water and sewage waste as the former bakery on the site.

Mr. Cervini said no, but the increase was an insignificant amount. The studies they performed did not show an excessive increase in water and sewage usage over what the bakery previously used.

Mr. Scozzafava said the bakery was using more water for their production than the brewery in Sackets, because brewery water usage is intermittent. The brewing process is start and stop on a much smaller scale than when the bakery was in full production.

Mr. Cervini said on the Engineering report, water meter readings for the bakery were 279,000 GPY and a conservative number for an estimate on the brewery is 313,000 GPY. Mr. Cervini said it is more but does not warrant increasing the size of the service or putting extra taxing on the City water service.

Mr. Katzman concurs that the City will be affected less than the proposed brewery.

Mr. Delaney said the Engineering Dept. investigated and found there would be no detriment to the City system in terms of the water or sewer service provided. The Engineering comments were made to indicate that if there are changes and/or expansions they will need a new evaluation. He said currently he has determined the current system to be sufficient.

Mr. Katzman asked what would happen when the brewery does major flushing of the brewery tanks such as when they perform a major discharge of water, and they must dispose of a thousand gallons in a hurry, how would it effect the City sewer system.

Mr. Cervini said there would not be any significance to the flow using an 8” pipe, and the time it allows it to get to the sewer main.

Mr. Katzman asked Mr. Delaney if he was comfortable with the explanation.

Mr. Delaney said he was satisfied, because the brewery would have the negative effect of the flooding, not the City sewer system.

Ms. Capone asked if the Planning Board had any other comments or questions.

Hearing no further comments, Mr. Katzman moved to recommend that City Council approve the request for a Site Plan Approval, submitted by Matthew J. Cervini, P.E. of GYMO, DPC on behalf of SHBP Realty Holdings, LLC for the construction of 624 and 960 square-foot building additions and a 1,632 square-foot loading dock canopy at 981 Waterman Drive, Parcel Number 9-43-101.005., contingent upon the following:

1. The applicant must ensure that the parking information in the Preliminary Engineering Report matches what is shown on the drawings and provided on site.
2. The applicant must submit a revised C-101 drawing showing the proposed additions in bold line type to differentiate between the existing features and to mesh the plans with the Preliminary Engineering Report.
3. The applicant must submit a standard photometric plan or similar evaluation of the existing lighting to ensure that the project site is adequately lit without any light spillage onto neighboring properties.
4. The applicant must obtain a Zoning Compliance Certificate and a Building Permit prior to construction of the project.

Mr. Johnson seconded the motion. All voted in favor and none opposed.

Mr. Katzman then moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Johnson seconded the motion, and all voted in favor. The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.